DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 326 529 SP 032 783

AUTHOR Hipps, Elizabeth Smith; Halpin, Glennelle
TITLE The Relationship of Stress Related to Performance-based Accreditation and Burnout in Teachers and Principals.
PUB DATE Nov 90
NOTE 39p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, November 13-16, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Accreditation (Institutions); Administrator Responsibility; Elementary Secondary Education; Job Satisfaction; Minimum Competency Testing; *Performance; *Principals; *State Standards; *Stress Variables; *Teacher Burnout
IDENTIFIERS Alabama; *Performance Based School Accreditation

ABSTRACT

Performance-based accreditation has been adopted by a number of states as a means of assuring that local school systems are maintaining quality education programs. The primary purpose of this study was to determine the amount of variance in burnout among Alabama public school teachers and principals that could be accounted for by stress related to the Alabama performance-based accreditation standards. The superintendents of nine Alabama school systems participated in a survey of educators' stress related to the Alabama standards. All 128 elementary and secondary principals and a stratified random sample of 445 teachers were surveyed. Responses of 219 teachers and 58 principals were usable. All subjects completed the Alabama Performance-based Accreditation Standards Stress Measure and the Maslach Burnout Inventory. The findings of the study suggest that for Alabama educators experiencing a significant amount of stress related to the state standards, burnout may be the result. A performance-based accreditation system may be needed for school improvement. However, because change has been shown to be less stressful when those affected by it participate in implementating the change process, teachers and principals should be involved extensively in plans for full implementation of any major reform in the educational system. The Alabama Performance-Based Accreditation Standard Stress Measures is attached. (37 references; 7 tables) (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED326529

THE RELATIONSHIP OF STRESS RELATED TO PERFORMANCE-BASED ACCREDITATION AND BURNOUT IN TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS

Elizabeth Smith Hipps
Muscogee County School District
Glennelle Halpin
Auburn, University

Paper presented at the meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, New Orleans, November, 1990.

SP032783

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. S. Hipps

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

THE RELATIONSHIP OF STRESS RELATED TO PERFORMANCE-BASED ACCREDITATION AND BURNOUT IN TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS

Background

Recent educational reform imperatives have intensified the push for accountability begun in the 1970s. The National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983) in their landmark report, A Nation at Risk, recommended that standardized tests "be administered at major transition points from one level of schooling to another" (p. 28) for the purpose of certifying the student's credentials. Minimum competency testing has been developed by educators and adopted by many school systems and states as "a means of holding the schools accountable for graduation of literate students who would at least be able to perform the basic skills of reading, writing, and arithmetic" (Beard, 1986, p. 1). Efforts have also been directed toward improving teacher education and staff development, curriculum, and instructional leadership with increased reporting to the general public concerning school progress and the use of funds (Buhler & Roebuck, 1987; Saterfiel & Woodruff, 1985).

Increased state control of educational programs has been reflected in the large number and the scope of state-level reforms initiated since 1983 (Mitchell & Encarnation, 1984). A Nation at Risk reminded state governors, legislators, school board members, and local officials that they have "the primary

responsibility for financing and governing the schools" (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983, p. 32, emphasis in the original) and that they should develop educational policies and fiscal plans which embody the proposed reforms.

Performance-based accreditation has been adopted by a number of states as a means of assuring that local school systems are maintaining quality educational programs (Buhler & Roebuck, 1987; Saterfiel & Woodruff, 1985). Originally intended as a means of protecting the developing medical profession and combatting fraud and low quality medical education programs, accreditation has come to be used to certify that certain standards in educational programs have been met (Harcleroad, 1983). Alabama schools are subject to a new performance-based accreditation system for the 1990-1991 school year. The new system is based on performance standards derived from 62 standards which were developed for the Impact Study carried out in 10 school systems during 1989-1990. Some of the stated purposes of the performance-based Accreditation System in Alabama are to "provide for verifying and reporting degrees of compliance with accreditation standards," to "serve as a vehicle for the continuous assessment and improvement of educational programs," to "inform the citizens regarding the status of public education, district by district," and to "increase the performance level of students" (Alabama State Department of Education (SSDE), undated, p. 3).

In spite of the stated benefits of the Alabama Performance-Based Accreditation System, many educators may experience

increased stress as a result of its implementation. Some researchers have found that increases in state-mandated programs are potentially stressful to teachers (Hoover-Dempsey & Kendall, 1982; Swick & Hanley, 1980). Alabama educators may find the 13 performance standards relating to student achievement and the six performance standards which address the assessment of student progress to be stressful. Also, educators may be stressed by the fact that local boards of education bear the responsibility of providing the funding necessary for meeting the standards (ASDE, undated). Buhler and Roebuck (1987) found that Texas teachers perceived personal stress to be very high and job satisfaction to be very low following the implementation of reform legislation. Higher perceived stress levels were associated with a lack of adequate support for reform and a sense of reduced "team spirit" among teachers, as well as lowered respect from the community. Schwartz, Olson, Bennett, and Ginsberg (1983) reported that changes in teachers' working conditions "added burdens which contributed significantly to feelings of isolation and helplessness and a sense of acquiring new responsibility without the authority to accomplish the task or the resources to get the job done" (p. 1).

Blackburn and Wilkes (1987) averred that the educational reform movement has affected teachers's morale, increased their workload, and "pushed them toward their frustration level" (p. 1). While little research has been conducted on a single specific aspect of reform and its effect on educator stress,

state and federal rules, regulations, and policies have been found to be stressful to administrators (Brimm, 1983; Gmelch & Swent, 1982; Manera & Wright, 1981). Floerke (1988) studied stress factors in public school superintendents in Arkansas and found that for all respondents the greatest stress producer was "complying with the new state standards." In addition, several researchers have found that "trying to gain public approval and/or financial support for school programs' was very stressful to school administrators (Brimm, 1983; Gmelch & Swent, 1982; Manera & Wright, 1981). Gmilch and Swent (1982) observed that "all members of the management team share many common stressors. What plagues superintendents, therefore, similarly plagues other members of their team, from the central office to the schools" (p.26). In studies of administrators in Arkansas and Oregon most respondents declared that at least 60% of their total life stress resulted from their jobs (Floerke, 1988; Gmelch, Koch, Swent, & Tung, 1982).

Friesen (1986) postulated a negative stress cycle with three distinct stages. At the first stage a stimulus, the stressor, makes demands on the individual, who perceives these demands as exceeding his/her coping resources. This perception of inadequate resources to cope with the stressful situation precipitates the second stage in the cycle, imbalance. If the consequences of failure to meet the demands of the situation are seen as serious, the imbalance increases. The final stage in the stress cycle depends on the individual's perception of the

demands, his/her resources, and the seriousness of the failure to meet the demands. This response stage may be mediated by some outside influence which reduces the stress or it may constitute a maladaptive response. One type of maladaptive response is burnout. Burnout is the result of unmediated stress. Dworkin (1987) has characterized burnout as alienation, or the opposite of commitment, reflecting the continued buildup of stressors and a perception on the part of the individual that these circumstances are not apt to change soon. The concept of powerlessness, which has been linked to alienation, "refers to feelings of non-involvement and estrangement experienced by an individual in societal interactions" (Stroud, 1987).

Research has shown relationships between teacher stress and decreased job satisfaction, inability to make decisions, diminished self-esteem, and lowered self-confidence and sense of professional competence (Needle, Griffin, Svendsen, & Berney, 1980; Swick & Hanley, 1980; Weiskopf, 1980). These feelings have caused many teachers to burn out, either leaving the profession or staying in teaching while experiencing high levels of stress. These burned out teachers may have negative attitudes and diminished capacities and may be less able to perform with the energy, attention, and capacity for involvement usually associated with better student outcomes. White and Stevens (1988) found that teachers' feelings about teaching, hindrances to teaching (paperwork, interruptions), and collegial

relationships with peers had an impact on students' reading scores.

Teachers and administrators who experience negative stress may be subject to any of a large number of physical or psychological disorders, including "coronary heart disease, asthma, kidney and gastrointestinal disease, hostility, depression, and nervous disorders" (Schwartz et al., 1983, p. 2). Golaszewski, Milstein, Duquette, and London (1984) found significantly greater total cholesterol and systolic blood pressure levels in teachers when compared to national norms by age and education. Educators reporting high levels of stress have also reported feelings of ineffectiveness on the job, anonymity, powerlessness, and confinement (Schwartz et al., 1983). Administrators under stress have been found to block out new information and to procrastinate (Lemley, 1987), thus reducing their effectiveness.

Administrators need an understanding of the sources of stress in themselves and in teachers (Farkas, 1983) and an understanding of the personal and organizational factors which can mediate the effects of stress in order to assure educational efficacy. While performance-based accreditation and similar systems of state accreditation standards have been used in states other than Alabama, no study relating any of these systems to educator stress has been conducted. Hoover-Dempsey and Kendall (1982) conducted an extensive review of the literature on teacher stress and found few studies which have addressed the problem so

as to determine specific findings concerning the sources, prevalence, and consequences of stress. Gmelch and Swent (1982), Floerke (1988), and Brimm (1983) have identified compliance with rules, regulations, and policies as stressful to administrators, but these researchers did not attempt to determine what proportions of educator stress could be accounted for by this stressor.

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the amount of variance in burnout in Alabama public school teachers and principals which could be accounted for by stress related to the Alabama Performance-Based Accreditation standards. The objectives of the study were:

1. to develop a measure of stress related to the Alabama Performance-Based Accreditation standards;
2. to determine the amount of variance in educator burnout which could be attributed to stress related to the Alabama Performance-Based Accreditation standards.

The following null hypothesis was investigated:

There is no relationship between the amount of burnout experienced by Alabama educators and the amount of stress related to the Alabama Performance-Based Accreditation standards.

The following terms are defined for use in this study:

1. Performance-based accreditation - A system of accountability and assessment of educational performance" (Evans, 1981, p. 18) in relation to stated standards for the purpose of accreditation of a school system.
2. Stress - A condition occurring in an individual when there is "a discrepancy between a problem or challenge and the individual's capacity to deal with or to accommodate to it (Mechanic, 1970, p. 111). McGrath (1970) added a further qualification "that stress or threat only occurs when the consequences of failure to meet the demand are important; or rather, when they are perceived by the organism to be important" (p. 18).
3. Burnout - "the final step in a progression of unsuccessful attempts to cope with negative stress conditions. Burnout then is the result not of stress per se . . . but of unmediated stress" (Farber, 1984). Maslach (1982) viewed burnout as a "syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment that can occur among individuals who do 'people work' of some kind. It is a response to the chronic emotional strain of dealing extensively with other human beings" (p. 3).

Methodology

The superintendents of 9 of the 10 Alabama school systems which participated in the Impact Study of Alabama Performance-Based Accreditation during the 1989-1990 school year agreed to participate in the survey of educator stress related to the Alabama Performance-Based Accreditation standards and burnout. All 128 elementary and secondary principals and a stratified random sample of 445 teachers from the nine school systems were surveyed. Responses were received from 242 teachers and 65 principals, resulting in an overall response rate of 53.6%. The responses of 219 teachers and 58 principals were judged to be usable.

Instruments

All subjects completed the Alabama Performance-Based Accreditation Standards Stress Measure and the Maslach Burnout Inventory.

The Alabama Performance-Based Accreditation Standards Stress Measure was developed for this study. The factors of the Alabama Performance-Based Accreditation Standards Stress Measure represented the categories of standards defined by the Alabama State Department of Education. The 43 items were taken directly from the proposed standards but were reworded in order to combine redundant items and to conform to the Likert scale response format. Subjects were asked to indicate whether they perceived a standard to be (0) not stressful, (1) somewhat stressful, (2) considerably stressful, (3) decidedly stressful, or (4) extremely

stressful. The six subscales were (a) Student Performance, (b) Personnel, (c) School Environment, (d) Opportunities-to-Learn, (e) Student Progress, and (f) Leadership and Planning. Responses to items in each subscale were summed and divided by the number of items in the subscale to obtain the stress score for the accreditation standards subscales. The RELIABILITY procedure of the SSPS-X statistical package was used to determine the coefficient alpha internal consistency reliability for the Alabama Performance-Based Accreditation Standards Stress Measure. The subscale reliabilities obtained ranged from .72 to .93 (N = 277) and are presented in Table 1. The Alabama Performance-Based Accreditation Standards Stress Measure is presented as an appendix.

Insert Table 1 about here

The Maslach Burnout Inventory, Second Edition, (Maslach & Jackson, 1986) resulted from approximately 8 years of research on the concept of burnout. According to Maslach (1982) burnout consists of three components: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment. Form ED of the Maslach Burnout Inventory was developed to measure these three components in teachers.

The Maslach Burnout Inventory consists of 22 items that reflect the frequency of the subject's feelings and attitudes defining the components of burnout. Respondents are asked to

indicate how often they experience feelings suggested by the 22 statements. A 7-point Likert-type response ranges from (0) never to (6) every day. Nine items make up the Emotional Exhaustion subsclae, five items make up the Depersonalization subscale, and eight items make up the Personal Accomplishment subscale. Subscale scores are determined by adding the responses on each subscale item together. Higher scores on the Emotional Exhibition and Depersonalization subscales and lower scores on the Personal Accomplishment subscales indicate higher levels of burnout.

The reported reliability statistics of Form ED consist of Cronbach's coefficient alpha estimates ranging from .76 for the Depersonalization and Personal Accomplishment subscales to .90 for the Emotional Exhaustion subscale (N = 469) (Iwanickl & Schwab, 1981). The same authors investigated the construct validity of Form ED by using factor analytic techniques. "Results indicated that when employed with teachers, the Maslach Burnout Inventory measures the same basic constructs or factors as those identified through studies in the helping professions" (p. 1167).

Coefficient alpha internal consistency reliabilities were determined for the present sample using the RELIABILITY program

of the SPSS-X statistical package and are presented for comparison in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 about here

Results

Canonical correlation analysis was used to determine whether or not a multivariate relationship existed between the Set 1 variables of stress related to the student performance, personnel, school environment, opportunities-to-learn, student progress, and leadership and planning categories of the Alabama Performance-Based Accreditation standards and the Set 2 variables of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment, as measured by the Maslach Burnout Inventory. Canonical loadings and cross-loadings, adequacy indices, and redundancy indices were examined. Of the three possible canonical roots, one was determined to be significant at the .05 level, and the null hypothesis was rejected. The Pearson correlation coefficients for the variables in Sets 1 and 2 are presented in Table 3. The canonical weights of the three possible canonical roots are presented in Table 4, the eigenvalues canonical roots are presented in Table 4, the eigenvalues and canonical correlations are presented in Table 5,

and the Wilks' lambda and levels of significance are presented in Table 6.

Insert Table 3 about here

Insert Table 4 about here

Insert Table 5 about here

Insert Table 6 about here

Results of the canonical analysis indicate that relationships do exist between burnout and stress related to the six categories of Alabama Performance-Based Accreditation standards in Alabama teachers and principals. The adequacy indices for Root 1 of .6322 for Set 1 and .6258 for Set 2 indicate that the canonical variates for the Set 1 and Set 2 variables represent them well, and the redundancy index for the Set 2 variate indicates that a small but meaningful proportion (10.64%) of the raw score variance in the Maslach Burnout Inventory is accounted by the canonical variate representing stress related to the Alabama Performance-Based Accreditation standards.

The canonical loadings and cross-loadings for Root 1 of the first canonical correlation analysis seemed to indicate a strong relationship between stress related to the Alabama Performance-Based Accreditation standards and both Emotional Exhaustion and Depersonalization burnout. (See Table 7.)

Insert Table 7 about here

Loading and cross-loadings of interpretable size were obtained for the School Environment, Opportunities-to-Learn, Student Progress, and Leadership and Planning subscales of the Alabama Performance-Based Accreditation Standards Stress Measure, indicating a significant and meaningful relationship between the subscales and burnout. Cross-loadings indicated that school environment standards stressors, opportunities-to-learn standards stressors, student progress standards stressors, and leadership and planning standards stressors were related to burnout. School environment standards address aspects of school facilities and school climate. Opportunities-to-learn standards address curricular offerings, instructional strategies, the presence of adequate instructional supplies and equipment, and instructional support services. Student progress standards address assessment of student learning and the uses of the assessments. Leadership and planning standards address the supervision of the instructional program, local school system governance, leadership at the school and system level, and involvement of the community

in planning for the instructional program. Educators may believe that implementation of these standards is beyond their control, especially since funding is left up to the local school system, but that they will still be held accountable. Maslach (1982) found burnout to be related to institutional rules and policy decisions in which the worker has had no input. Phillips and Lee (1980) reported that being held accountable for learning outcomes was stressful to teachers, because the teachers believed that the learning outcomes were largely the result of factors over which they had no control. Adams (1975) found burnout to be related to institutional rules and policy decisions in which the worker has had no input. Phillips and Lee (1980) reported that being held accountable for learning outcomes was stressful to teachers, because the teachers believed that the learning outcomes were largely the result of factors over which they had no control. Adams (1975) found that teachers felt frustrated and burned out when changes were demanded of them without their being given the means and authority to implement the changes, and administrators were found to be highly stressed by compliance with rules in several studies (Brim, 1983; Gmelch & Swent, 1981, 1982; Lam, 1988; Manera & Wright, 1981). Buhler and Roebuck (1987) found educator reaction to reforms to be negative for all groups, with job stress rated as very high. The strong loadings and cross-loadings obtained for the subscales of the Maslach Burnout Inventory on Root 1 indicate the strength of the relationship between the Set 1 canonical variate and burnout. An educator who

experiences a high degree of stress related to the Alabama Performance-Based Accreditation standards is more likely to experience burnout.

Recommendations

The findings of this study suggest that for Alabama educators experiencing a significant amount of stress related to the Alabama Performance-Based Accreditation standards, burnout may be the result.

Schools and school systems must change in order to meet the needs of a changing society, and a performance-based accreditation system may provide the solution needed for school improvement. However, because change has been shown to be less stressful when one has had an opportunity for participation in it, teachers and principals should be involved extensively in plans for the full implementation of any major reform in the educational system. Educators who are not directly involved in the plans for implementation should be fully informed of the agenda and its ramifications for their personal work situations.

Researchers at the University of Texas have developed a model for staff development based on educators' levels of concern for the implementation of innovation (Hall, Loucks, Rutherford & Newlove, 1975). Using their model to measure the reactions of teachers and principals to the implementation of performance-based accreditation, plans for staff development could be made which will move educators through stages from vague awareness of the system to refocusing on the benefits of performance-based

accreditation and retraining to develop the individual skills needed to make the system work. Training for acceptance of the new system should begin with the principals, who will serve as the facilitators of the changes needed in their schools. Through cooperation and coordination within the schools, the principal should lead teachers to apply their creativity to finding ways to meet the new standards, rather than focusing on their apparent impossibility.

Because change will always be necessary in educational meetings, and stress accompanies change, undergraduate and graduate educator preparation programs and school system staff development programs should include courses in stress management. In addition, school systems should provide resources and encouragement for physical exercise programs and support groups to intervene before educators burn out.

Of the performance-based accreditation standards stressors which were found to contribute significantly to educator burnout, many reflect situations which educators may perceive to be beyond their control because of problems associated with adequate funding. School systems need to involve their local communities in the plans for the future of education for their young people in order to enlist the financial and moral support necessary to implement change in the schools. Legislators must be convinced that schools cannot improve without adequate funds. Educators must not fail to take on the responsibility of persuading the

general public of the importance of support for the educational system.

Further research is needed relating demographics to stress associated with school reform. Relationships between position held and school level may be found to be significant and may also reveal findings which may be applied in order to intervene before stress becomes burnout.

Research into the amount of stress and burnout being experienced by Alabama educators should be conducted after the full implementation of the Alabama Performance-Based Accreditation system in order to determine whether or not a significant amount of stress exists and to identify potential means for dealing with the stress. Research comparing the specific methods of implementation and the degree of involvement of school-level educators should be conducted in order to identify the appropriate amount of involvement and mode of implementation of change with the lease amount of stress. Results of such research should be used to develop a model for the implementation of change within schools and school systems which includes the participation of educators at all levels and which addresses the management of stress associated with the change.

REFERENCES

Adams, D. W. (1975). Tired and frustrated teachers. Today's Education, 64(1) 37, 40-41.

Alabama State Department of Education. (1989). The Alabama Performance-Based Accreditation System manual. Montgomery, AL: Author.

Beard, J. G. (1986). Minimum competency testing. ERIC Test and Measurements Digest, 86(1). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 284 910)

Blackbourn, J. M., & Wilkes, S. T. (1987). The prediction of teacher morale using the Supervisory Conference Rating, the Zones of Indifference Instrument and selected personal variables. Paper presented at the 1987 annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 290 768)

Brimm, J. L. (1983). What stresses school administrators. Theory Into Practice,22(1), 64-69.

Buhler, J. H., & Roebuck, F. N. (1987, February). Effects of legislated educational reforms on in-service teachers' perceptions of self, students, and careers. Paper presented at the meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, Houston, TX. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 283 802)

Dworkin, A. G. (1987). Teacher burnout in the public schools. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Evans, E. (1981, May). Competency and accountability--The focus of the accreditation and evaluation process. In J.Schechter (ED.), Proceedings of an Invitational Symposium (pp. 18-22). Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 208 569)

Farber, B. A. (1984). Teacher burnout: Assumptions, myths, and issues. Teachers College Record, 86, 321-338.

Farkas, J. (1983). Occupational stress as affected by locus of control and situational powerlessness. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Research Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 231 047)

Floerke, K. L. (1988). Occupational stress factors as perceived by public school superintendents in Arkansas. Dissertations Abstracts International, 49, 1637A. (University Microfilms No. 88-18, 268)

Friesen, D. (1986, April). Overall stress and job satisfaction as predictors of burnout. Paper presented at the meeting of The American Educational Researach Association, San Francisco. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 274 698)

Gmelch, W. H., Koch, J. L., Swent, B., & Tung, R. (1982, March). What stress school administrators--and how they cope. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 218 760)

Gmelch, W. H., & Swent, B. (1981). Stress and the principalship: Strategies for self-improvement and growth. NASSP Bulletin, 65(449), 16-19.

Gmelch, W. H., & Swent, B. (1982, March). Management team stressors and their impact on administrators' health. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 218 761)

Golaszewski, T. J., Milstein, M. M., Duquette, R. D., & London, W. M. (1984). Organizational and health manifestations of teacher stress: A preliminary report of the Buffalo Teacher Stress Intervention Project. Journal of School Health, 54(11) 458-463.

Hall, G. E., Loucks, S. F., Rutherford, W. S., & Newlove, B. W. (1975). Levels of the use of innovation: A framework for analyzing innovation adoption. Journal of Teacher Education, 26(1), 52-56.

Harcleroad, F. F. (1983). Accreditation: A voluntary enterprise. In K. E. Young, C. M. Chambers, H. R. Kells, & R. Cargo (Eds), Understanding accreditation. Washington,DC: Jossey-Bass.

Hoover-Dempsey, K. V., & Kendall, E. D. (1982). Stress and coping among teachers: Experience in search of theory and science. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 241 503)

Iwanicki, E. F., & Schwab, R. L. (1981). A cross-validation study of the Maslach Burnout Inventory. Education and Psychological Measurement, 41, 1167-1174.

Lam, Y. L. J. (1988). External environmental constraints and job related stress on school administrators. The Journal of Educational Administration, 26(2), 250-265.

Lemley, R. E. (1987). Guidelines for recognizing the subtle indicators of stress. NASSA Bulletin, 71(497), 134-137.

Manera, E., & Wright, R. E. (1981). Real job pressures: Knowing the difference between stress and challenge. NASSP Bulletin, 65(449), 10-15.

Maslach, C. (1982). Burnout: The cost of caring. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Maslach, C.,& Jackson, S. E. (1986). Maslach Burnout Inventory manual (2nd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

McGrath, J. E. (1970). A conceptual formulation for stress research. In J. E. McGrath (Ed.), Social and psychological factors in stress (pp. 10-21). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Mechanic, D. (1970). Some problems in developing a social psychology of adaptation to stress. In J. E. McGrath (Ed.) Social and psychological factors in stress (pp. 104-123). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Mitchell, D. E., & Encarnation, D. J. (1984). Alternative state policy mechanisms influencing school performance. Educational Researcher, 13(5), 4-11.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative of educational reform. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Needle, R. H., Griffin, T., Svendson, R., & Berney, C. (1980). Teacher stress: Sources and consequences. The Journal of School Health, 50(2), 96-99.

Phillips, B. N., & Lee, M. (1980). The changing role of the American teacher: Current and future sources of stress. In C. L. Cooper & J. Marshall (Eds.), White collar and professional stress (pp. 93-111). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Saterfiel, T. H., & Woodruff, J. B. (1985, April). A new model for school accreditation: Applying school effectiveness measures to assess educational quality. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 255 565)

Schwartz, H., Olson, G., Bennett, A., & Ginsberg, R. (1983). School as a workplace: The realities of stress. Chicago: Roosevelt University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 239 009)

Stroud, S. D. (1987). The relationship of locus of control, powerlessness, and job satisfaction as perceived by nursing faculty (Doctoral dissertation, Auburn University, 1987). Dissertation Abstracts International, 48, 1672A.

Swick, K. J., & Hanley, P. E. (1980). Stress and the classroom teacher. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Weiskopf, P. E. (1980). Burnout among teachers of exceptional children. Educational Children, 47, 18-23.

White, W. F., & Stevens, R. (1988). Teacher morale and student achievement. Reading Improvement, 25(3), 222-232.

Table 1

Reliability Coefficients for the Alabama Performance-Based Accreditation Standards Stress Measure

Subscale	Chronbach's alpha (N = 277)
Student Performance	.87
Personnel	.76
School Environment	.72
Opportunities-to-Learn	.93
Student Progress	.93
Leadership and Planning	.90

Table 2

Reliability Coefficients for the Maslach Burnout Inventory Subscales

Subscale	Cronbach's alpha	
	Survey sample (N = 277)	Iwanicki & Schwab sample (N = 469)
Emotional Exhaustion	.91	.90
Depersonalization	.69	.76
Personal Accomplishment	.74	.76

Table 3

Pearson Correlation Coefficients for

Variables in Sets 1 and 2

	SPERF	PERS	ENVIR	OPPLRN	SPROG	LDR	EE	DP	PA
SPERF	1.0000	.5134	.4412	.4792	.4282	.5399	.1569	.1872	-.0457
PERS		1.0000	.7293	.7096	.6345	.6827	.2071	.2150	-.2117
ENVIR			1.0000	,7993	.7635	.7761	.2820	.3035	-.2856
OPPLRN				1,0000	.7722	.7907	.3141	.3487	-.2538
SPROG					1.0000	.7925	.2795	.3070	-.2646
LDR						1.0000	.3053	.3044	-.2469
EE							1.0000	.6062	-.3492
DP								1.0000	-.3560
PA									1.0000

Note. SPERF = Student Performance Standards

PERS = Personnel standards

ENVIR = School Environment standards

OPPLRN = Opportunities-to-Learn standards

sprog = Student Program standards

LDR = Leadership and Planning standards

EE = Emotional Exhaustion burnout

DP = Depersonalization burnout

PA = Personal Accomplishment burnout

Table 4

Canonical Weights of the Three Possible Canonical Roots

Variable	Root 1		Root 2		Root 3	
	Raw	Standard	Raw	Standard	Raw	Standard
			Set 1			
Student performance	.11036	.09884	-1.00706	-.90198	-.28525	-.25304
Personnel	.23093	.20564	.75659	.67373	.11628	.10355
School environment	-.26309	-.31501	.57017	.68269	-.47030	-.56311
Opportunities-to-learn	-.53049	-.54563	-.96975	-.99744	-.43776	-.45026
Student progress	-.17426	-.19622	.20585	.23178	-.75587	-.85109
Leadership and planning	-.24932	-.23668	.07466	.07088	2.05475	1.95051
			Set 2			
Emotional exhaustion	-.03116	-.35135	-.01269	-.14308	.10825	1.22057
Deperson-alization	-.10065	-.50559	-.13481	-.67718	-.19181	-.96355
Personal accom-plishment	.06747	.40241	-.16595	-.98973	.03426	.20433

Table 5

Eigenvalues Canonical Correlations

Statistic	Root 1	Root 2	Root 3
Eigenvalues	.20490	.03146	.00483
Percentage	84.95527	13.04186	2.00287
Canonical correlation	.41238	.17463	.06934
Squared correlation	.17006	.03050	.00481

Table 6

Wilks' Lambda and Level of Significance

of the Three Possible Canonical Roots

Roots	Wilks' Lambda	F	df	Significance of F
1 to 3	.80076	3.4438	18.00	.000
2 to 3	.96484	.9714	10.00	.467
3 to 3	.99519	.3261	4.00	.860

Table 7

Canonical Loadings, Cross-Loadings, Adequacy, and Redundancy of the Significant Canonical Root

Variable	Canonical loading	Canonical cross-loading
	Set 1	
Student performance	.4153	.1682
Personnel	.6488	.2666
School environment	.8917	.3674
Opportunities-to-learn	.9435	.3888
Student progress	.8734	.3599
Leadership and planning	.8759	.3605
Adequacy Index	.6322	
Redundancy Index	.1075	
	Set 2	
Emotional exhaustion	.7984	.3294
Depersonalization	.8619	.3558
Personal accomplishment	-.7051	-.2901
Adequacy Index	.6258	
Redundan Index	.1064	

APPENDIX

PERFORMANCE-BASED ACCREDITATION

STANDARDS STRESS MEASURE

Performance-Based Accreditation Standards Stress Measure

Use the scale below to indicate the extent to which you find the following accreditation standards to be stressful:

Scale: 0 - not stressful
1 - somewhat stressful
2 - considerably stressful
3 - decidedly stressful
4 - extremely stressful

Standards specifying:

1.	Minimum acceptable passing rate on Alabama High School Graduation Exam.	0 1 2 3 4
2.	Minimum percentage of competencies which must be achieved by a minimum percentage of students in your district.	0 1 2 3 4
3.	Minimum acceptable percentile levels on norm-referenced achievement tests for students in your district.	0 1 2 3 4
4.	That the number of students scoring in the first three stanines on the achievement tests must be equivalent to the first three stanines on the ability test.	0 1 2 3 4
5.	That students in grade 5 must pass the state assessment of writing skills.	0 1 2 3 4
6.	That students must pass end-of-course tests in designated subjects.	0 1 2 3 4
7.	Minimum average daily attendance.	0 1 2 3 4

8.	A maximum allowable drop-out rate.	0 1 2 3 4
9.	A minimum plan for the utilization of educational technology.	0 1 2 3 4
10.	A minimum plan for instructional improvement and the establishment of goals and priorities for each academic year.	0 1 2 3 4
11.	That professional staff be certified.	0 1 2 3 4
12.	That sufficient support staff be provided.	
13.	That a system in-service/staff development program be implemented.	0 1 2 3 4
14.	That a planning period be provided for all teachers.	0 1 2 3 4
15.	That school facilities be accessible, safe, clean, conducive to learning, and properly equipped.	0 1 2 3 4
16.	That a variety of curricular offerings be provided.	0 1 2 3 4
17.	That all courses required for high school graduation be arranged so students may complete them in 4 years.	0 1 2 3 4
18.	That students be in class or in a board approved activity every period of the school day.	0 1 2 3 4
19.	That teachers use a variety of classroom grouping arrangements and instructional techniques.	0 1 2 3 4

20.	That all students have equal access to instructional support services which are coordinated with community resources and services.	0 1 2 3 4
21.	That students have equal access to instructional materials needed to fulfill program objectives.	0 1 2 3 4
22.	That certified personnel deliver art and music instruction to all students in grades K-8 and as an elective in grades 9-12.	0 1 2 3 4
23.	That counseling and library media services be provided by certified specialists in grades K-12.	0 1 2 3 4
24.	That promotion/retention decisions be based on local policy.	0 1 2 3 4
25.	That school systems must comply with federal and state statutes.	0 1 2 3 4
26.	That local boards of education adopt written policies to govern the operation of the school system.	0 1 2 3 4
27.	That each school system assure full-time supervision of the instructional program.	0 1 2 3 4
28.	That classroom observations be used to promote positive teaching practices and eliminate counter-productive classroom practices.	0 1 2 3 4

29.	That principals involve teachers, parents, and students in formulating a mission statement and in long-range planning, shared decision-making, and periodic needs assessments.	0 1 2 3 4
30.	That principals use efficient techniques in assignment of staff, operation of facilities, scheduling of time, and the use of materials and equipment.	0 1 2 3 4
31.	That schools report to the public annually concerning their progress in meeting stated goals along with goals for improvement in the next school year.	0 1 2 3 4
32.	That the local board of education secure adequate financial support to meet the standards for accreditation.	0 1 2 3 4
33.	Maximum class sizes and pupil-teacher ratio.	0 1 2 3 4
34.	A minimum number of students in a school.	0 1 2 3 4
35.	Implementation and evaluation of a curriculum plan for each subject.	0 1 2 3 4
36.	A minimum plan for at-risk students.	0 1 2 3 4
37.	That a variety of assessment methods be used.	0 1 2 3 4
38.	That assessment be consistent with instructional objectives and school goals.	0 1 2 3 4

39.	That assessment results be used to guide instruction.	0 1 2 3 4
40.	That assessment results be used to promote total student development.	0 1 2 3 4
41.	That assessment of critical thinking skills be in evidence.	0 1 2 3 4
42.	That a district-wide comprehensive performance-based personnel system be implemented.	0 1 2 3 4
43.	That a school climate improvement plan, based on current assessment, be implemented.	0 1 2 3 4